

APRIL 1953

Stalin

by Asoka Mehta

STALIN embodied an epoch. Capitalism had fragmented man, socialism was expected to make him whole again. Stalin sought to take away his individuality, his agonies and ecstasies, and absorb him in a mass-man. In the place of an orchestrated human being, dreamt of by savants and saints, the dictator became the one Voice and reduced all others to echoes.

The Stalinist vision was enshrined in words by the communist poet, Bertold Brecht. In his play, *Die Massnahme*, he makes the director of the Party House warn the young revolutionaries :

"Then you no longer are yourselves. No longer are you Karl Schmitt of Berlin. You are no longer Peter Savich of Moscow. You are all without name or mother, blank leaflets on which the Revolution writes its order."

The Control chorus enunciates in the play a new ethic :

"What vileness would you not commit to exterminate vileness?

Could you change the world, for what would you be too good?

Who are you?

Sink into the mud, embrace the butcher, but change the world; it needs it."

When it is recalled that communists, immediately after the October Revolution, thought other dreams and saw other visions, Stalin's achievements assume their full proportions. Poets like Ernest Toller were wont to mine out of their sufferings and tragic experiences a deep social awareness and poignant art. Like Brecht, Toller too felt that he was without mother, but how differently! In his autobiography he could write the self-searing sentence, "I died, was reborn, I died, was reborn, I was my own mother." His great play, *Masses and Man*, was a humanist's eloquent protest against absorbing an individual

into a collective, into an abstraction. Toller had to commit suicide, and Brecht became a literary laureate of the communist world—such was the pattern of Stalinist unfolding.

Stalin put not only art but culture in a strait-jacket. Both were harnessed to the needs of the State. *Raison d'état* became the ultimate *rationale* of all Stalin's efforts.

History is the memory of a people. Stalin consistently re-wrote History. Not merely judgments but facts were changed retrospectively. Men's memories were sought to be unhinged.

Czarist Russia, with all its crudities and cruelties was the home of the finest literature and the greatest music. The October Revolution, with the vital social changes that it ushered in and the brisk social mobility it fostered, released forces of creativeness. But the rigid control of the State and the Party made all art banal and reduced the artist, always a non-conformist, into a senile and frightened yes-man. Over and over again, Stalin asked for better, more useful art and he issued further instructions every time. Like currency in a runaway inflation, the *dictats* drove, art from bad to worse. The artists soon declared that Stalin's world was free from all conflicts! Art is the child of anguish and ecstasy. In Stalin's world these emotions were exiled. When conflicts disappear, man is either a God or a brute. In Stalin's land there were no Gods.

Capitalism brought with it the worship of the big, of the huge. Stalin made it the central religion. By emptying the small yet vitally significant achievements and sufferings of their meaning, he strove for men to run after the huge, and the huge, like the horizon, always eludes the grasp. Capitalism's *beau ideal* was the Economic Man, Stalin's hero was the Stakhanovite. Both idealised the producer and robbed man of his other dimensions.

The modern world hovers between excruciating complexities and banal securities. Either a man faces the challenge and seeks to reshape the world in the image of his understanding and emotions or surrenders his

initiative and responsibility and seeks the shelter of an over-arching authority. In the Inca Empire such a stability had been achieved and Stalin revived it against all philosophies of poise and self-culture.

The Empire of Inca had economic development as well as social security to its credit. Likewise Stalin worried about tools and techniques and sacrificed the states of mind and spirit as empty hallucinations.

Stalin's effort at making man a conformist and thereby comfortable has been the greatest of its kind in history. Often man has sought that refuge in his distracted pilgrimage. But snuffing of conflicts leads inevitably to an abridgement of the meaning and power of life, its surge and its sweep.

Culture is only partly social, much of it is self-culture and the awareness one is able to achieve of unity of all life. Such culture can grow only in the climate of freedom. The cross of responsibility cannot be separated from the quest for culture. Stalin has tried to separate the two and to millions he has given the illusion that the attempt has been crowned with success. If the whole world saw him as a warning, as it sees in Hitler, Stalin would belong to the limbo of the forgotten. But because many see in him an inspiration and a hope, as the tired, parched caravan clingingly believes in the mirage, that men of good hope have to bestir themselves.

All dictators foster movements from reason to unreason, from integrity to belief. Darkness at noon ceases to be a strange phenomenon when it is con-

ceived as a means of winning light everlasting. In the world today man, driven by anxieties, is tired and jaded. He yearns for simple solutions and easy ways out. For all such men Stalin is the beacon-light that invites.

Men of good hope will see in Stalin and all that he has wrought not objects of hate, but of deepest sympathy. The deranged, however diabolical, deserve one's understanding. It was Stalin's poet who asked his men to sink into vileness and embrace the butcher. To deem Stalinism a vileness and fight it with vileness is to embrace the butcher oneself. Stalin has triumphed because in many hearts and homes we have allowed life to become barren. While socio-economic changes are necessary, the ultimate hope lies in the resurgence of humanity, in the restoration of man's faith not only in his fellowmen but in himself. To be oneself, to see others blossom to their full, not to see oneself robbed in the flowering of other people but to see oneself enriched in it is the only solvent of Stalinism.

The votaries of Cultural Freedom yearn to give man back his heritage, of being a pilgrim, if need be a lonely pilgrim. Heightening of awareness, of emotions and sensibility is the one antidote to the onrush of the huge and the mighty. To move away, periodically, from organizations and movements and experience awakening and understanding is a part of the necessary discipline of freedom. At the death of a great tyrant, let all men of good-will pause and ponder awhile.

Notes

First Things First

AS an organisation devoted to the values of freedom in which members of both the Congress and the Praja Socialist Parties are along with others actively participating, it is natural that the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom should follow with interest and sympathy discussions which have been directed towards better understanding and co-operation between these two major democratic Parties in our country.

Our study of democratic processes in various parts of the world and the dangers that the free society has to face lead us to two conclusions. First, that freedom of opposition to the Government of the day by one or more democratic Parties is of the essence of democracy. Secondly, that in the face of the totalitarian threat, there is need for democratic Parties to be aware of the large area of agreement which they have in common amongst themselves and to defend it against the threat of totalitarianism, both internal and external. It is against the background of these fundamentals that we have watched the current discussions in which the spokesmen of the Congress and Praja Socialist Party are now engaged.

While as a non-political and non-partisan group we have no concern with the actual form of co-operation on a political level which, in the light of circumstances prevailing, may emerge in a particular State or States, we are interested in the basis on which such discussions are proceeding. Most of the explanations emanating from New Delhi have so far stressed that the reason for such a rapprochement is the fact that "communalism" is rearing its head and needs to be combated jointly. We are not quite clear just what parties or groups are sought to be so labelled, but we concede that it may be legitimate to concert measures if it is felt that sectarian tendencies of a divisive nature are getting inordinately strong. What causes concern, however, is that a threat to democracy and to the very independence and integrity of the country which far exceeds in its dangerous potentialities that presented by communal groups has not been stressed in these reports. We refer to the threat posed to this country by International Communism and its fifth column in this country. This in our view is the primary danger against which all democrats need to rally and join forces. An absence of its awareness and a pre-occupation with a much lesser threat appear to us to be a defective point from which to approach the problem of such democratic co-operation. At best, this may be a case of mistaken emphasis and priorities. At worst, it may lead to a situation where the real enemies of the country can utilise the bogey of "communalism" not only to distract attention from their

own sinister designs but actually manage to infiltrate into the ranks of democrats by joining in denouncing such a bogey, as in fact is today happening in certain parts of the country. If the Praja Parishad agitation in Kashmir is to be opposed, is Mr. G. M. Sadiq, the Communist President of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly, a worthy ally in that cause? Would Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon be a worthy spokesman in the U.N. for an anti-totalitarian coalition?

Failure of a Mission

AFTER eighteen months of incessant activity, U.S. Ambassador Chester Bowles has concluded his assignment in New Delhi. Numerous tributes have been paid to the warmth with which he approached the Indian Government and people, and his identification with their aspirations and their emotions. There has also been widespread reference to the personal popularity he has won for himself. These tributes are undoubtedly well-earned and deserved.

Few have cared, however, to ask why, despite his devoted efforts relations between India and the leading Western Democracy have failed to show a corresponding change. Mr. Bowles took over when the tide had already turned in favour of a relaxation of tension. The decision in favour of accepting U.S. economic aid had already been made. Alongside of this there was an awareness in New Delhi that India had overplayed its hand in boycotting the San Francisco Peace Conference with Japan. Mr. Bowles' liberal accent certainly helped to make a *detente* possible.

Nevertheless, it must be sadly conceded that today the gulf between the Indian and American foreign policies has, if anything, widened and that anti-Americanism has spread to wider sections of the intelligentsia. The unneutral pronouncements of the Prime Minister on Stalin's death and on Eisenhower's assumption of office paralleled by more marked emphasis in the speeches of Vice-President Radhakrishnan, show that if Mr. Bowles has succeeded in winning popularity in these authoritative circles it has been for himself and not for his country. On Korea, communist China, or collective security, the Indian Government's attitude has registered no improvement from the viewpoint of the United Nations.

It is possible, of course, that nothing Mr. Bowles could do would have mended matters since international relations are determined by other and more compulsive influences. At the same time it is perhaps possible to discuss where Mr. Bowles went wrong. Basing himself from the start on the major premise—not unfounded in fact—that India's foreign policy was one man's creation, he came to the conclusion—in this case a *non sequitur*—that he must concentrate exclusively on the Indian Prime Minister. To this pursuit he devoted himself unsparingly. Hoping to convince Pandit Nehru and to soothe his suspicions about U.S. desires to influence Indian opinion, the Ambassador is credited with being responsible for the soft-pedalling of the activities of the U.S. Information Services,

which ceased to be an effective factor in the cold war of ideas waged dynamically by the Soviet and Chinese Governments and their Indian fifth column. It is now disclosed that he similarly tried to silence anti-communist broadcasts to India on the Voice of America.

Unfortunately, this policy failed to yield the response which was expected. Its motivations were perhaps misunderstood. The attempt to understand neutralism in place of combating it gave neutralist thinking more respectability and a wider vogue. The egregious blunder of an exclusive interview to a crypto-communist journal was the logical culmination of such a process.

The lessons that the failure of Mr. Bowles' mission teaches would appear to be that those who represent the democracies in a peripheral country such as India should seize the initiative in the cold war of ideas which is being waged in such countries by the Soviet and Chinese dictatorships, that while attending to the needs of the Governments the need to educate and enlighten public opinion should not be overlooked, and that economic aid unaccompanied by ideological co-operation and approximation is an undependable foundation on which to build democratic solidarity.

Suppressed Tremors

TRUTH, like murder, will out even if it happens to be a communist country wherein it is sought to be suppressed. A PTI-Reuter report from Hong Kong of an earthquake that occurred six months ago in Tibet is an instance in point. It happened in September last year in the Pongdo and Tanpu districts some hundred miles north of Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. It was not, however, until the New China News Agency recently announced the relief measures taken by the Central Government of China that the outside world came to know of it. We did not suspect that the blackout on the news of the underground movements in communist States also applied to subterranean disturbances. After this who can discount the occasional news of troop movements and military installations that leaks out from behind the Iron Curtain of the Himalayas?

Communists in State Service

THE Communist Party is different from all other political parties in that it insists on conformity, both in action and in thought, and in every aspect of life, professional and personal, with every *dictat* of the Party in a manner that no democratic party does. This distinctive attribute was described by the Prime Minister of India in his statement of March 18 as the "monolithic structure" of the Communist Party. The Communist Party also has extra-territorial loyalties and is known to be directed from abroad. Notwithstanding the alleged dissolution of the Comintern, directives from Moscow come, covertly as well as overtly through the Cominform journal published in Bucharest, Rumania, under the ironic title *For a Lasting Peace, for a Peoples' Democracy*.

Communism of the Stalinist variety has thus become more a conspiracy than an ideology. Anyone who is part of such a conspiratorial machine is obviously unfit to hold Government office or to teach in Government educational institutions. The first qualification of a teacher is to have an objective mind and to exercise academic freedom in the classroom. This right to teach the truth as he sees it is denied by the Communist Party to its adherents, as has been proved in judicial investigations made in other countries. The Chief Minister and Government of Bombay will therefore be perfectly justified in taking the step they contemplate of banning the employment of communist adherents in Government service. It is an example other States may follow with advantage. It is to be hoped that proper precautions will be taken to ensure that no non-communist suffers through misapplication of such a measure.

Shabash !

THE authorities of Osmania University in Hyderabad had deserve to be congratulated on their acquiring a visiting professor in the person of Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon. We are not told on what subjects Mr. Menon would lecture, but we presume the University would naturally like to avail itself of Mr.

Menon's unequalled experience of international affairs, diplomacy and modern history.

The students of Osmania will have reason to be grateful for the dispassionate analyses with which they will be provided, with that objectivity so vital to academic life and so natural to Mr. Menon. He will teach his students that Poland and Czechoslovakia are today the freest of free countries, that it was the U.N. advance to the Yalu river that started the war in Korea, that every single Chinese prisoner of war in U.N. hands is just dying (choice term) to get back to Mao's protection. Going a little further back in history, the visiting Professor, in between jaunts to U.N. Headquarters in New York, will explain to his listeners how reactionery it was of the British Labour Party to expel him from its list of prospective parliamentary candidates for 'United Front' activity and how right it was for the India League in London to dissociate itself from Mahatma Gandhi's ill-timed Quit India campaign of 1942, what time his beloved Britain and still more beloved Russia were allies. His listeners, who were in middle school during the days of the "Peoples' War", will undoubtedly see the point.

Meanwhile, what could be more consoling for the veterans of the Telengana "War of Liberation," now licking their wounds, than to have the moral support of a visiting Professor in their midst till the time comes round for raising the banner of "Liberation" again?

<The Intelligentsia In Modern Society

The Imperial Hotel in Tokyo was the venue in November, 1952 of an unusual discussion in which writers and publicists from various parts of the world participated. The participants were MINOO MASANI from our own country; FRANCOIS BONDY, Swiss editor of PREUVES, and Secretary of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in Paris; HERBERT PASSIN, American anthropologist, co-author of JAPANESE VILLAGE IN TRANSITION, and a research worker of the Social Science Research Council; President KENZO TAKAYANAGI of Zeikei University and Chairman of the Japanese Committee for Cultural Freedom, who recently visited India; MATSUHEI MATSUO, Secretary for the Japanese Committee for Cultural Freedom and Executive Secretary of the Japanese Institute of Pacific Relations; JINJI KOBORI, one of the founders of the Japanese Communist Party and now member of the Executive Board of the Japanese Committee for Cultural Freedom, who was imprisoned for several years during World War II because of his opposition to Japanese militarism; and TAKEO NAOI, Tokyo Correspondent of the NEW LEADER, who also underwent imprisonment for a while for opposition to Japanese militarism.

FREEDOM FIRST has pleasure in making available to its readers a condensed version of this discussion.

Takayanagi: We are very glad to have with us Mr. François Bondy from Paris and Mr. Minoo Masani from India. We are also glad to have Mr. Herbert Passin of the United States. We have chosen the subject: "The Role of the Intelligentsia in Modern Society." We should like to compare notes on the situation in Japan as well as in the three countries represented. First, I would like to ask Mr. Bondy to make a statement on that subject.

Bondy: In Europe, the intellectuals have played traditionally a great role in the creation of and generating the political and moral climate of their countries. They are not just the products of the political, social, and economic conditions of the various European societies in which they live, as perhaps some Marxists would like to classify them. They have

their own traditions going back to the functions of the intellectuals as priests, or lay priests, or "clerics," as we would say, in the Middle Ages. People have looked to intellectuals as persons of a certain culture and instruction for guidance in their everyday life and values.

Such important political changes in Europe as the French Revolution, the many national revolutions of 1848 and the Russian Revolution, were led by intellectuals and had their origin partly in intellectual movements.

Intellectuals are not always aware in Europe of their great power in changing political conditions and creating a moral climate. Sometimes they defend theories which lead to oppression, without imagining the reality they help to bring about. They think that

it is their privilege to say whatever they like and to play with every theory, and don't expect the consequences to destroy their own freedom. One problem which our movement, the Congress for Cultural Freedom, stresses most in Europe is the problem of the responsibility of the intellectual, who should be aware of the far-reaching consequences of what he says and does and should feel a sense of loyalty to ideals of freedom and truth to which he himself owes the cultural heritage which he possesses.

Takayanagi: We will ask now Mr. Passin to make a statement on this general subject from the standpoint of an American.

Passin: The intellectuals in the United States have always occupied a very different role from the intellectuals in any other country in the world. In the first place, the intellectuals have never occupied the key role in any political movement or in any of the social and economic developments in the United States. It is very difficult to try to determine why this should be the case. There has never been the sense that the intellectuals have been far and away distinguished and superior to anybody else. Theirs is only one voice among many.

As a matter of fact, to some extent, we find in the United States almost the reverse of what we find in other countries. That is, instead of a systematic respect for the intellectuals, there tends to be a systematic denigration of the intellectuals in American political life. There is probably no more severe charge in American politics than to call someone an intellectual. The intellectual has become a caricatured figure in American politics, in American newspapers and cartoons, as a person utterly impractical, as a person possessing no capacity for making practical contributions. It is further regarded that the theoretical concepts of intellectuals are, by the very fact that they are from intellectuals, of no practical value whatsoever.

Possibly because of historical factors in the development of American civilization, there remains the fact that the greatest contributions have been made by people in practical fields. Now this practical contribution is one that comes also from intellectuals, but not in their capacity as intellectuals. It comes in their capacity as practical men whether in science or journalism, human relations, politics, law, or in any other field in which they can make a practical contribution.

In a sense I would consider that the practical contributions to the development of American civilization have been greater from the intellectuals in the United States than in any other country. But it has not been in their capacity as intellectuals in the European and Asiatic sense, that is, not because of their theoretical capacities and theoretical formulations, but because they have been primarily concerned with the application of science and intelligence to the solution of practical problems. And it is a singular thing that this concept of the necessity of the application of knowledge and science is not limited only to engineers and physicists and chemists but also extends down to the humble American social scientists as well, who are

more concerned with how their findings and their theories and their social science can contribute to practical affairs than with the development of any systematic theories. Now, this effort stands in very great contrast to our impression of the conception held by intellectuals in many parts of Europe, and certainly in Asia, to practical problems.

Takayanagi: Mr. Passin pointed out that the American situation is in great contrast to the European situation as pointed out by Mr. Bondy. We are greatly interested to hear from Mr. Masani of India, who comes from a country of an old civilization.

Masani: The happy situation portrayed by Mr. Passin of a democratic society where the intellectual is kept in his place unfortunately does not exist in my country by reason of historical situations which arise partly from social backwardness and partly from the legacy of British imperialist rule. The British created a tremendous gulf between the educated class and the uneducated mass, unlike the United States. On top, you have a large class of graduates created by the British for administrative purposes who are now the intelligentsia, and below you have the illiterate and uneducated mass denied even the benefits of primary education. This has given the intellectual an importance altogether undeserved by his contribution to social development. It has created an unbalance which is not desirable in a democracy. A new Brahmin class of the intelligentsia who can read and write, particularly those who can read and write in English, has now been created, and it is this class which is today the ruling class in India. India is not ruled by the capitalists or landlords or by the proletariat, but it is ruled by people who can read and write, and who use their monopoly of knowledge to influence and dominate those who have not got that knowledge.

There are among the intellectuals people of great learning, with a great tradition, men of science, of letters, of philosophy, of spiritual understanding, but these are exceptions, and the large number of the so-called intelligentsia have only a smattering of modern scientific education. A little learning, it is said, is a dangerous thing. This may be true of the large part of the intelligentsia, certainly in my country and may be in others, because that learning has uprooted them from their past tradition and has yet not given them something complete in return, a way of life, a faith, an ideology. Hence this class is susceptible to all kinds of influences. So long as Gandhi was alive he, by reason of the close contact he maintained with the mass of the Indian people, particularly with the peasantry, was able to prevent any harm being done, but since his death, the intellectuals have no discipline or anchorage.

The communists have seen the opportunity, and the Communist Party in India, by reason of this situation, is concentrating the larger part of its ideological attack not on the peasants, not even on the workers or trade unionists, but on the intelligentsia. The communists have made the largest advance among the upper class intelligentsia because of the factors that I have mentioned already. It is not the starving peasant or the

poor worker in India who talks about the legitimacy of dictatorship so long as it gives bread. It is the upper class intellectuals who ask: "What is freedom worth to a man who hasn't got enough bread and enough security?" and then suggest that the great achievements—so-called—of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist regime should be reproduced in our own country at the cost of every kind of freedom that we know. The communist hopes, through this confusion that he is able to spread, that he can so divide and split the Indian ruling class or élite that the will to resist may be destroyed and India may be taken over in the same way that Czechoslovakia was taken over and destroyed in February 1948. It is not ruled out that he may succeed.

Takayanagi: Now it is Japan's turn to make a statement, and I ask Mr. Kobori to speak of the Japanese situation.

Kobori: As is well known, Japan first became a modern, unified national state only in 1868, some twenty years after Marx wrote the *Communist Manifesto*. Therefore, in order to unite the best in Japanese culture with Euro-American culture, the intellectuals had to take in foreign culture at a gallop, as it were. Leaving the masses behind, they alone rushed forward. And herein we find the distinctive characteristic of the Japanese intelligentsia, which also explains why they were separated from Japanese tradition and were therefore unable to relate the newly-acquired Euro-American culture to traditional Japanese culture.

In the same way as in Europe and America, the Japanese intelligentsia too have an important role in the development of modern Japan. Consequently, the general masses respect them. However, they do not feel close to them. This separation of the intelligentsia from the masses and from Japanese tradition must be scored as their great weakness. And it is from this that their opportunism derives.

Takayanagi: Anything to add, Mr. Naoi?

Naoi: The fact that Japan is an island country and that it is historically and geographically isolated from the rest of the world is still a factor that conditions the Japanese intellectuals. For example, American and English labour leaders and scientists at a very early time actually went to the Soviet Union and were able to see what the exact conditions were there, and they developed a great deal of experience. As a consequence, they were able to observe Soviet political developments critically, but in the Japanese intelligentsia there is none of this. That is why at the present time, Webb's *Soviet Communism, a New Civilization* has come to be one of the best sellers in Japan. It seems to me that our task is to determine how this gap of isolation can be filled in.

Masani: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that the last remark made by Mr. Naoi is very important. That is, how is this unwholesome gap between the intelligentsia and the people as a whole to be eliminated?

Takayanagi: Mr. Bondy?

Bondy: I believe England is European in those respects which we discuss. The great Labour Party basically originated in a little intellectual group of writers such as Shaw, Webb, Wells, and from this intellectual group it has become a great political strength. Also today intellectuals are very much distrusted, and not always wrongly so in the labour movement. We have here, as elsewhere, at least in Europe, the ambiguity, the tormented relation between the intellectuals and the masses. It is bad if intellectuals are arrogant, proud of their privileges, aloof from the people. It can be equally bad if they are too humble, full of guilt for their privileges, and just wanting to go to the people and to be close to the masses. Both ways are dangerous. One leads to a caste system of intellectual superiority with no moral responsibility; the other leads to a blind surrender to the emotional forces of the masses, which may be bad for the masses as well as for the intellectuals. And we try to steer the course of those intellectuals who feel the responsibility between undue arrogance and undue guilt feelings, which sometimes leads to emotional surrender, such as the "peace" campaign, just because the intellectual wants to prove how well he is on the right side, on the side of progress, of peace, of people's emancipation, without thinking, as an intellectual should, about the methods which he uses and about what the methods are really likely to achieve.

Passin: Mr. Masani, I wonder if you will permit me to raise a point that I think would bring the discussion to a more central focus. It seems to me that the central problem of the relation of the intellectual to society in modern times lies in the relation of the intellectual to the totalitarian pressures of our times. Now, it seems to me a singular thing that intellectuals who, of all people, should be primarily concerned with the preservation of the conditions of the freedom of their own activity, historically in the 20th Century seem to be less capable of formulating a programme for its defense than other groups in the population. Now, what I have in mind is this. We saw that in Germany during the period of the rise of Nazism, large numbers of German intellectuals adhered to the Nazi policy and provided it not only with physical support but with intellectual support. Where did the intellectual support for race theories come from? And this is true in Japan as well. We know that a large number of the intelligentsia in Japan have supported, or kept quiet under, the militarists in Japan. Now when we confront the major totalitarianisms of modern times we find that the intellectuals seem to be unable to formulate conditions for the preservation of their own freedom of action, and they seem somewhat suicidally willing to accept political terms which will, in effect, destroy them as an independent element of society. Why is it that in various countries of the world we see this suicidal phenomenon? Why is it that the intellectuals, who should be concerned to preserve their intellectual freedom, often devote themselves to the justification of the abolition of intellectual freedom?

Kobori: The same statements that were made concerning the relation of the intellectuals to the Nazis may also be applied to Soviet totalitarianism. As I stated before, the Japanese intelligentsia are separated from the masses, but intellectuals of conscience among them want to relate themselves to the masses. However, this too is mechanical. And this mechanical association with the masses manifests itself politically as opportunism.

What I would like to say particularly here is that the intellectuals should drop this mechanical association with the masses and simply be faithful to the truth. And for this, cultural freedom must be defended. I feel that this is where the main emphasis must be placed.

Masani: I was very glad that Mr. Kobori raised this point because I too was going to draw attention to what James Burnham has called the "Managerial Revolution." While it is true as Mr. Passin says, that communist dictatorship would mean suicide for the people and for a large part of the intelligentsia today, could it not be argued that it is some kind of selfish self-interest on the part of at least a section of the intelligentsia—the technocrats and the bureaucrats of both business and government—that they think that they would be more important and more powerful and less responsible to the common people under a communist dictatorship than they are in a democracy, whether of a capitalist or socialist kind?

Now, as Burnham points out, the managerial revolution consists in the technocrats and bureaucrats using power to establish a new system of privilege masquerading as a proletarian revolution. I think this is probably not a very conscious process, and the only suggestion I could make as to how the intelligentsia could be weaned from this pursuit is to make them conscious that a communist dictatorship is not a liberation of the proletariat or the masses, but a new and a more reactionary kind of caste and class society. If this is done and conviction can be carried to the people and to the intelligentsia that communism is the path of retrogression and not of progress, then I do believe that the appeal to their conscience will succeed, and they will be unable to rationalize their craving for power under the guise of emancipation of the common people, which justifies it in their eyes. Therefore, the only answer I can suggest is that an educative campaign about the reality of the slave labour system in the Soviet Union and the similar systems being spread to China and the other captive States is the only prophylaxis against the self-delusion of the intellectuals.

Bondy: I believe that modern society goes more to the power of party secretaries, people who know now how to manage men, than to engineers, technicians and people who know how to manage nature, and that, therefore, it requires much more of the old traditional power game to know where to place people and to play with index cards. A man like Adolf Hitler, who was a low kind of intellectual with little knowledge of nature and history, knew how to manage

human forces and was more powerful than all the technicians, industrialists, managers, and intellectuals of much superior qualifications because he had that one important qualification—to know how to manage people and to know where the power springs from where to manage people. I would say the same, although the psychological differences are great for Stalin. Therefore, creative intellectuals, who really are interested in knowing nature and history, will rarely be the people who have real power in totalitarian society.

Takayanagi: Mr. Passin has made a suggestion a few minutes ago about the failure of the intelligentsia to resist Hitler or resist militarism or resist Stalin in totalitarian states, and I think the answer is that when power is established in totalitarian states, it is in such a situation very difficult to expect the intelligentsia to sacrifice their own life and the welfare of their families. There are, of course, a few such who exist, but the majority has to follow whatever their self-interest tells them. But in a non-totalitarian state, the position may be different, and the view suggested by Mr. Masani and Mr. Bondy refers to the capacity of the intelligentsia in the non-totalitarian states to resist the danger of becoming totalitarian states. These are two separate questions, I think. The latter question is more important, don't you think so, Mr. Passin?

Passin: Well, the intellectuals of all countries, as I said before, should be more concerned with the preservation of the traditions of their own intellectual freedom, and yet it is the curious fact in modern society that the intellectuals very often seem least concerned with the problems of totalitarianism. Let us take some examples. Under Hitler, biology took a certain direction. It had to support racist theory. Any independent scientist who did not agree with this simply had no place in Germany. He could not stand up honestly, conduct his researches, and publish his conclusions if he disagreed with the State. Another interesting matter was that in spite of the great development of physical theory in Germany under Hitler, Einstein's views were regarded as a form of "Jewish physics" and, therefore, entirely unacceptable and physicists could not acknowledge that there was anything to Einstein's theories. Now, we have some very interesting parallels. For example, in the Soviet Union, if any geneticist or physiologist or biologist thinks that heredity is transmitted in a certain way and conducts researches on the basis of this idea or conducts independent researches which come to conclusions with which the State does not agree, he has no room for existence in the Soviet Union. And we know that in the case of the Lysenko controversy, many of the principal participants have either been executed, imprisoned, liquidated, or sent to Siberia—or have disappeared from the academic world. We notice another very interesting thing in Soviet physical theory, for example: the fact that they regard Einstein's theory not yet as a "Jewish" theory, which is the Nazi form, but as a "bourgeois" theory, a bourgeois theory which, for all communist physicists, must not be accepted. It seems to me that since the history

of the world shows us that powerful State intervention of any form of totalitarianism inevitably tries to impose its ideas upon science and intellectual life, that the scientist should be concerned about it. Now, the scientist in the Western world could see the problem with respect to Nazi totalitarianism. It seems to me that, if the facts are presented, they should also be capable of seeing the problem as it presents itself with respect to the Soviet Union or any other totalitarian state. That is, if they want to conduct independent research and come to their own conclusions, then they must defend themselves against totalitarianism, because totalitarian states find it necessary for some reason or other to develop systematic theories that are imposed upon the scientists, and if they disagree they cannot carry on their own independent activities.

Kobori: To put it very simply, this is because the intellectuals think of their knowledge as a saleable commodity. That is, as Mr. Masani has pointed out, since under communism, the intellectuals believe they can advance themselves as bureaucrats, they are unconcerned about totalitarianism. Therefore, it seems

to me that the important point for us in developing our movement lies in the liberation of the intellectual from the notion of knowledge as a saleable commodity and towards the idea of knowledge as the pursuit of truth.

Masani: It is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, from this discussion we are all agreed that for good or for ill the intellectual has a very important part to play. "If the salt loses its savour, wherewith shall it be salted?" That draws attention to the very important part that the Congress for Cultural Freedom throughout the world has to play through its national committees and its international organization. It has a great part in this fight for human values and for a free society, and it draws attention to the fact that every intellectual who believes fundamentally in the freedom of life should join this great united front against totalitarian aggression, both intellectual and otherwise, to make it strong, so that it can perform its task of bringing understanding and knowledge to the intellectual and, through the intellectual, to the people throughout the world.

AFTER STALIN

"AFTER Stalin" was the theme of a public meeting organised by the Democratic Research Service in Bombay on March 13. After the death of Stalin this was perhaps the first gathering in this country which denounced Stalinism.

Mr. M. R. Masani, from the Chair, sternly warned: "For democrats to relax because of Stalin's death would be a tragic mistake. He was the most efficient and ruthless embodiment of an evil system of total regimentation of thought and of life which survives his death and continues to threaten world peace and freedom." Mr. Masani deplored the adulation which had been lavished in Parliament and in sections of the Indian Press on "the most brutal tyrant of modern times" as a disservice to the Indian people, and observed that this homage to the incarnation of brute force which ignored the blood, agony and tears of millions of Stalin's victims was hardly worthy of those professing loyalty to the ideals of Mahatma Gandhi. He ended by saying that the death of the dictator was a deadly blow to the power and stability of the Soviet empire and the vacuum would take some time to fill. Meanwhile, the dictatorship would be off its balance. The suppressed desire for freedom of the captive peoples of Russia and the satellite countries could now be helped to find expression, provided the democracies were alive to their opportunities. "Now, if ever," he ended, "was the time to raise the banner of liberation."

Mr. Purshottam Tricumdas said that Stalin in his lifetime had succeeded in putting back the clock of human civilization by five hundred years. He accused responsible leaders of abetting the communists in their work of hoodwinking the public by propagation of the Stalin myth. He contended that the succession of

one dictator by another would make little difference to the rest of the world.

Mr. Prabhakar Padhye followed Mr. Purshottam and agreed with him that it was mere wishful thinking to anticipate any break in the Russian hierarchy which would react favourably on the world outside the Iron Curtain. He pointed out that it was significant that Stalin's successor was cast in the same mould of ruthlessness and any chance of a scramble for power was remote. "The main weakness," Mr. Padhye ended, "of the Soviet citadel is that they had made Stalin such a gigantic deity that it will take years for Malenkov to attain the stature of his master."

Prof. G. D. Parikh expressed the view that the future would depend upon what the democratic camp would do to enrich the lives of the downtrodden millions, and that nothing would come of the mere change of actors on the Soviet stage.

Smt. Umadevi, a Pole by birth, and now an Indian citizen described the blood-baths and massacres which preceded and immediately followed upon the communist seizure of power in Poland and satellite countries. It was her opinion that in the event of a suitable opportunity, the "silenced slaves in these countries would overthrow the communists and usher in democracy."

Mr. Asoka Mehta, General Secretary of the Praja Socialist Party, speaking last, said Stalin had been the apogee and the apotheosis of an epoch the achievements and failures of which should lead men to a saner way. But he was doubtful whether the protagonists of this saner way would be afforded an opportunity to shape the future of mankind. He asserted that the expansionist and aggressive actions of Soviet Russia had brought the world nearer to another global war. Indeed, he deprecated talk of a cold war, since in his view a hot war was already being waged in Korea.

The Tasks Of Our Leadership

by Adam Adil

I am afraid, Mr. J. B. H. Wadia's reply in the last issue of *Freedom First* to Mr. Sampurnanand's article, "The Tasks of our Leadership," which appeared in the previous issue, is out of place in an age which is witnessing the reassertion of moral and spiritual values. Mr. Wadia objects to the word 'religion' in Mr. Sampurnanand's insistence on the vital need to train "the younger generation for the citizenship of this world" through a moral education, the basis of which must be either "religion or a philosophic substitute for it," and asks, "how exactly religion in its accepted sense could succeed in bringing the Indian Society out of the morass of moral degradation and lay the foundations of the age of moral man in Indian Society." Mr. Wadia dissents from Mr. Sampurnanand's thesis that "a society can be inspired by religion without its government ceasing to be secular."

In order to substantiate his broadside against religion, Mr. Wadia cites some well-known facts of history and accuses religion of having brought about tyranny and human degradation. And to the argument that it is "not religion but its abuse," which has been responsible for the exploitation of one man by another, and tyranny and degradation, Mr. Wadia replies that "that abuse is inherent in the very concept of religion which demands abject subservience to a postulated Supreme of Supremes."

To me, this is a very astounding statement. I fail to understand Mr. Wadia's contempt for the "Supreme of Supremes," which can not only be the "God" of religion, but also a political ideal like democracy and socialism or Bentham's utilitarian objective of "greatest good of greatest number," or a philosophic concept of highest state of existence such as Buddha's 'Nirvana' and Vedantin's 'Brahman' or 'Satchidananda' and Dante's 'Beatific Vision.' And all these "Supremes of Supremes" demand complete allegiance. It is no different if the "Supreme of Supremes" of religion also demands it. As a matter of fact, no thinking man can ever live worthily without a concept of "Supreme of Supremes" in one sense or another. And at no time in history the conformation to this "Supreme of Supremes" has ever led to tyranny or human degradation, unless it was a reactionary ideal such as that of fascism and communism or unless it was the profit motive of capitalism, which laid the foundation of imperialism in the 19th century. Even the God of religion has refrained from tyranny unless it was a jealous God of the type of the one of the ancient Hebrews, who tolerated the concept of no other God but of Himself. And today we hardly find a devotee of such a jealous God. Mr. Wadia contradicts himself when he concedes to "secularism" the possibility of losing "its identity" and sailing "under false colours" and denies the possibility of degeneration to "religion."

Again, Mr. Wadia has misrepresented the religions of India. In fact, no Indian religion has ever led to

tyranny and consequent human degradation. The Indian spirit has been always characterised by complete freedom in religious matters. Unlike Plato, who had sanctioned the suppression of antagonistic ideas, the Indian philosopher or preacher of religion has always upheld the other man's right to have his own philosophy and religion. The circumstantial evidence of the famous Chinese pilgrim, Hiuen Tsiang, who visited India in the first half of the 7th century and stayed here for 14 years bears full testimony to these facts. It is true that a section of what Mr. Wadia calls "Brahmanic priestcraft" misbehaved, but there have been "Brahmins" who played an extraordinary progressive role. Even Gautami whom I would like to call the "Brahmin of Brahmins" was so broadminded as to admit an intelligent boy of doubtful parentage into the Brahmin fold as mentioned in Brihadaranyaka Upanishad. On the whole, the Brahmins zealously guarded the treasure of wisdom, knowledge and learning and the spiritual lore of India for untold ages, which is, indeed, not a mean achievement. Again, non-Brahmins played an equally important part in the intellectual life of India. For instance, most of the authors of the Upanishads were non-Brahmins. And the greatest intellectuals like Vyasa, Valmiki, Buddha, Krishna, Janaka, Parpata, Mahavira, Kalidas and Bhartrahari were all non-Brahmins. The social and political degradation of India was due to quite different causes, and certainly not due to the religion of the Brahmins. Religion cannot be blamed for the ills that result from the economic self interest of man.

It may be true as Freud propounds that the origin of religion can be traced to early man's 'childish' feeling of helplessness in a hostile world and to his longing for 'a guiding and protecting father.' But it cannot be denied that as human thought advanced and specially after Europe entered an era of religious toleration in the second half of the 17th century, religion has increasingly come to be recognised, as Prof. Whitehead would characterise, as "world loyalty," which is indeed, an ancient Indian concept—the concept of the *Pravritti Dharma*. And nobody now accepts the Semitic myth that only one religion is true. On the other hand Shri Krishna's famous dictum, which was reasserted by the great Sufi, Fariduddin Attar centuries later, that "all religions lead to God" is a common belief of all religious minded people. This is a progressive sign which deserves to be welcomed and not condemned.

It is in this sense that Mr. Sampurnanand uses the word "religion" and not in the Machiavellian sense as Mr. Wadia mistakes it to be. It is, in other words, in the Bergsonian sense of 'open religion' with its direct contact with the *élan vital*, the creative spirit.

Mr. Wadia advocates that the "main task of our leaders is not to be secular in a loose sense but to be so in its real democratic perspective, "which he calls

practice of secularism in the best traditions of liberalism." No one disagrees with Mr. Wadia on this point. But at the same time one would like to point out that one cannot be secular in the best traditions of liberalism unless one has a strong sense of moral values. Otherwise secularism would degenerate into tyrannical totalitarianism as it happened in the case of communism. Mr. Wadia seems to accept this fact when he talks of 'moral man' in society through 'moral education.' If it is so, may I point out that religion in its highest sense is the bedrock of all moral values? And being so, as Benjamin Kidd has so conclusively demonstrated in his book *Social Evolution* religion is the source of all human progress. Prof. Tawney proves the same thesis in his *Religion And The Rise of Capitalism*.

This is precisely what Mr. Sampurnanand means when he refers to the society "inspired by religion without its government ceasing to be secular." As a matter of historical fact, again, the liberal spirit of tolerance has been the chief feature of truly religious men of all lands at all times.

Mr. Wadia while concluding once again contradicts himself. It was when he says that he is 'not against the usefulness of religion to society at its present level' and in the same breath calls the use of religion by readers "rank opportunism."

If religion can be useful in some way, why should our leaders not make use of it to that extent?

ADAM ADIL

To The Editor

I have been reading your Journal with no little interest. Your advocacy of freedom and democracy and stress on human values and human dignity have been a source of inspiration to me and many a time it has spurred me to action.

I am a member of one of the Insurance Employees trade unions. My trade union, along with other similar trade unions, has been affiliated to the Insurance Employees' Federation. The Federation, thanks to communist domination, is on evil days. The communists have been making a surreptitious entry not only into the insurance employees unions, but also into other middle-class or white collared trade unions with the bait of offering free legal advice.

Ordinarily, good lawyers would not like to take work in the Industrial Courts, because, not only it is not a paying proposition, but they do not like to charge the employees' unions their professional fees. Four or five non-communist Industrial Court lawyers that are there, though moderate and reasonable in their fees, would like to settle their terms in advance and payments made accordingly. But our communist lawyers ask nothing, settle nothing, but receive at times more than the non-communist lawyers. Where fees are not demanded, collections are caused to be made through their own agents and purses accepted, which invariably amount to much more than fees. The employees so pauperised in the cause of the 'revolution' are assured that the purse money will be

usefully spent in the cause of the working class movement. And where purses are not available, I think roubles rescue the reds.

With a view to invade the white-collared movement, lately more and more communist lawyers have been released in this field by the local reds. Not only the exploited employees are exploited more, but communist nets are clandestinely cast.

Here is the gauntlet thrown at the democratic forces! Will they accept it? What is the earthly good if high and noble principles of freedom and democracy are allowed to be murdered at the hands of the communist lawyers in the trade union field? With the rise of communist lawyers, free trade unionism should suffer and languish. Your Journal, which is one of the foremost crusaders in the war against communism and totalitarianism, should appeal to the conscience of the free democratic forces to rise and assert themselves. It may be that a small monetary loss will have to be borne by the democratically thinking lawyers, but this sacrifice is worth it, and will bring results a thousandfold.

Will your journal give the clarion call and enlist the services of good lawyers to work in the Industrial Courts?

Bombay, March 14.

M. KERKERA.

FREEDOM FIRST

is the Monthly Bulletin of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, which is affiliated to the World Movement for Cultural Freedom.

Material published in this Bulletin may be reproduced and copyright is not reserved.

Annual Subscription Post-free (Inland) Rs. 3/-
" " " (Foreign) \$1 or 7 sh.
Single Copy 3 annas

Articles and letters for publication and all enquiries may please be addressed to

THE INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM,
127, MAHATMA GANDHI ROAD,
BOMBAY 1.

BAN

Hungary has banned Sherlock Holmes—News Item

We can indeed well understand
Why Sherlock Holmes, the dick, is banned,
Yes, why that digger-up of data
Is one *persona* who's *non grata*.
For there is fear of such a sleuth
In lands where they have murdered Truth.

—Richard Armour in the *New Leader*.

Review

The Third Force in China

by Carsun Chang (Bookman Associates, pp.345, \$4.50)

"THE Western powers must show their determination to detach China militarily from Soviet Russia, support must be given to Formosa and the guerilla bands on the mainland of China, and the British Commonwealth and the United States must lead the Asian countries in united action against communism."

This is the advice to the West of Carsun Chang, an outstanding Chinese liberal leader. As an Asian, he warns the neutral bloc—India, Burma and Indonesia—that their policy could only achieve "dictatorship internally and a Russian alliance externally." He minces no words on what this has meant for China, where "the foreign policy of the communist regime . . . is world revolution under the leadership of the U.S.S.R., while the interests of China as an independent country are submerged or non-existent."

Carsun Chang took refuge in India after Shanghai fell to the Reds, and stayed there until about a year ago. On the basis of his intimate contact with the Indians, he warns Prime Minister Nehru, whom he first met in a Chungking bomb-shelter, that India has "forsaken her position of aloofness and adopted a pro-communist stand," and that this subterfuge "will have a deleterious effect upon future relations between India and China." He warns India "to be wary" of Red traps.

Mr. Chang knows whereof he speaks. As a liberal Asian himself, he portrays the so-called Indian "liberal," Sardar Panikkar, who was New Delhi's Ambassador at Peking, as either a red or a hypocrite. He provides instances in which Panikkar's words conflicted with facts that the envoy could not help knowing. "There is no doubt," Carsun Chang writes, "that Panikkar's attitude is deliberately in favour of communist China." (I myself recall that, when Panikkar passed through Hong Kong, he saw a number of writers and others individually and, when these people saw each other later, they discovered that the Indian envoy had told each of them a different story! Such tactics ultimately catch up with people—and nations.)

Carsun Chang's book contains the most impressive condemnation that I have yet read of India's international policy. Coming from someone whose honesty and sincere motives are unquestioned, and whose liberalism should make him political kin to India's most revered leaders, his straightforward words should receive a careful and tolerant hearing in that part of the world.

He has gone through the mill the hard way—like Chiang Kai-shek. Their greatest test is now, when fate requires that the Third Force and the Nationalists subordinate their differences in a common fight against the enemy of both. They need not merge; this would not be practicable. The least they could do, and what they must do if the mainland is to be liberated, is to work toward a common end, abstaining from interference with each other, endeavouring where possible

to smooth the path of the other.

Carsun Chang's outline of the history of the past decade in China provides new light on what happened, because of the author's participation in historic negotiations. He recalls ex-Ambassador Hurley's curious report to Washington that Chiang Kai-shek had changed his attitude fundamentally in three months, from believing "that the Communist Party in China was an instrument of the Soviet Government in Russia" to feeling "that he can reach a settlement with the Communist Party as a Chinese political party without foreign entanglements." This just wasn't true; it was based either on misinformation or on wishful thinking. Yet, this point of view was the basis for the dispatch of the ill-fated Marshall mission, with which Mr. Chang had much to do as a mediator between the Nationalists and the Communists.

The Third Force mediation, as his own writing makes evident, had as much to do with the disastrous outcome as anything else. Without the inexcusable and sometimes purposeful naïveté shown by these so-called Chinese liberals toward the Reds, and the amazing ease with which the communist conspirators used them to chisel away more and more of the Nationalist position, the entire Red coalition plot could not have succeeded. The Red conspiracy was so broad that it required success on several fronts simultaneously to succeed, and, to the amazement of its perpetrators, it won handily on them all.

The author fitly describes the culpability of both Chiang Kai-shek and the U.S. He flatly says that U.S. policy, "in abandoning its support of Chiang," and Soviet policy, "in backing the Chinese communists," combined to insure Chiang's defeat and Mao Tse-tung's triumph. He declares the U.S. and Britain at Yalta gave Manchuria to Soviet Russia, enabling Moscow to use that area as a base for aggression, while we held off the Nationalists until the Communists were fully prepared to advance southward.

His stress on the importance of Manchuria as a base should turn our thinking to Formosa, also a base, but which the same so-called liberals who made the Manchurian base available to world communism have been trying to prevent the free world from keeping!

The necessity of keeping Formosa as a base, and exploiting it, is fully understood by Carsun Chang. This puts him in a dilemma that he doesn't solve—what to do about Chiang Kai-shek. His blame of Chiang Kai-shek is thorough, and he presents sufficient evidence to support his case. He declares that it was impossible for Chiang, even if he did not allow a corrupt penny to touch his own fingers, not to know that his closest associates were dirtying themselves and everything they touched with graft. Chiang's central characteristic, his suspicious nature, has been responsible for his misuse of men and misjudgment of events, and has made him pull political and military boners that otherwise he surely would have avoided.

Carsun Chang's book fills a gap long felt in the China library.

—Condensation of Review by Edward Hunter,
in the *New Leader*.

With Many Voices

“The deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
’Tis not too late to seek a newer world.”

—Tennyson.

“Only a political moron or an incorrigible apologist of Russia can assert that Stalin was interested in Peace as we understand it.”

—Thought, March 21, 1953.

The Bowles set only one limitation to their activities. They shunned those individuals and institutions who were not known to be friendly to Mr. Nehru.

—Insaf in *The Hindustan Times*, March 17, 1953.

Communists shouting “Stalin Zindabad” and others shouting “Indian Republic Zindabad”.

—Report in the *National Standard*, March 18, 1953, of a public meeting organised by the Democratic Research Service, Bombay.

The U.S.S.R. has a long record of professing peace and practising the opposite to live down.

—Editorial in *The Hindustan Times*, March 17, 1953.

Let us not give up English which we have acquired by accident of history (Mr. C. Rajagopalachari).

—*The Hindustan Times Weekly* (Supplement), March 8, 1953.

Washington, February 19: Mr. Harold Stassen, U.S. Director of Mutual Security, said here on Tuesday that under President Eisenhower, the U.S.A. “will neither be a unilateral bully nor a multilateral ‘milquetoast’ (timid person).”

—*The Hindustan Times*, February 20, 1953.

When at a meeting after he (Mr. Bevan) had referred to Mahatma Gandhi, Lenin and Stalin, someone asked him about Mr. Churchill, he burst out: “I was talking only of respectable people.”

—Bombay Newsletter in *The Hindustan Times*, March 1, 1953.

INDIAN COMMITTEE FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

127, Mahatma Gandhi Road,
BOMBAY 1.

Please enrol me as a member of the Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom. I remit the annual membership fee of Rs. 3/- by.....

Name :

Address :

Signature

The Lysenko-mania of these ‘progressives’ has given currency to a story which runs somewhat like this: A Rumanian peasant tells another, “Have you heard of the latest demonstration of Lysenko’s theory? They have produced by crossing a cow and a giraffe an animal which grazes in Rumania and is milked in Moscow!”

—*The Hindustan Times*, February 26, 1953.

The “Third Force” is a mere euphemism for the division of the West to make it easier prey for Communist ambitions.

—*The Free Press Bulletin*, February 19, 1953.

Mr. Bevan also spoke of what he called the “wisdom of the weak.” But out of weakness, wisdom never comes.

—Editorial in *The Hindustan Times*, February 18, 1953.

The man who still belongs to a communist front outfit shares the guilt for Stalin’s anti-semiticism as surely as those who belonged to the German Bund shared the guilt for Hitler’s anti-semiticism. One cannot countenance totalitarianism in general and take issue with a particular aspect of it.

—Eugene Lyons in *The New Leader*, March 2, 1953.

The Government of India recently issued a circular to the Ministries not to use the term “satellites” in official communications.

—Parliamentary Correspondent in *Cross-Roads*, February 21, 1953.

We do not allow an eminent scientist like Sokhey to visit Korea for investigating into charges of germ warfare.

—Parliamentary Correspondent in *Cross-Roads*, February 21, 1953.

A psychologist once said that the only difference that separated mankind from the animals was the introduction of the stage of reflection between stimulation and action. Amidst laughter Mr. Bevan said it could be said that the U.N. represented that stage of reflection in international affairs.

—*The Hindustan Times*, March 1, 1953.

Every nation can adapt for itself the line of the Roman poet: “I am human: nothing human can I consider alien.”

—Thought, February 7, 1953.